

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THINK PAIR SHARE STRATEGY  
TOWARD STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION  
AT THE SECOND YEAR OF SMPN 1 AIRTIRIS  
OF KAMPAR REGENCY**



**By**

**MARTINA SUSANTI**

**NIM. 10714000711**

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING  
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU  
PEKANBARU  
1433 H/2011 M**

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THINK PAIR SHARE STRATEGY  
TOWARD STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION  
AT THE SECOND YEAR OF SMPN 1 AIRTIRIS  
OF KAMPAR REGENCY**

A thesis

Submitted to Fulfill One of the Requirements for  
Undergraduate Degree in English Education  
(S.Pd.)



By

**MARTINA SUSANTI**

**NIM. 10714000711**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION  
FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING  
STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU  
PEKANBARU  
1433 H/2011 M**

## ABSTRACT

This research entitled "*The Effectiveness of Think Pair Share Strategy toward Students' Reading Comprehension at The Second Year of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency.*" The objective of the research is to know whether there is significant Effect of students' reading comprehension between students who are taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS) Strategy and those who are taught by using Three Phase Technique at the Second Year of SMPN I Airtiris of Kampar Regency.

The type of the research was an experimental research and the design of the research was pre-experimental design, which used experimental class and control class. The researcher took two classes of the second year students of SMPN 1 Airtiris as sample. The class was VIII A as control class and VIII B as experimental class by using cluster random sampling. The number of class VIII A and VIII B are 60 students. Both class are administered a pretest at the beginning, different treatment in the middle and posttest at the end of the research. The posttest result of experiment class and control class was compared in order to determine the effect of the treatment.

In this research, the researcher used test as instrument to collect the data. The test was used in order to find out the students reading comprehension in narrative text. The data of this research are the score of the students' reading comprehension obtained by using reading test.

In analyzed the data, the researcher used graduated standard (SKL) of English lesson at the second year of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency. The graduated standard (SKL) was 60 for students' reading comprehension. It means for those who get score  $< 60$ , they do not pass graduated standard (SKL), while for those who get score  $\geq 60$ , they are pass graduated standard (SKL). In order to find out whether there is a significant effect between students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share Strategy and students' reading comprehension who are taught by using conventional strategy, the data were analyzed by using independent sample T-test through using SPSS 16.0.

Based on researcher finding showed that there significant effect between students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share strategy and students' reading comprehension who are taught by using conventional strategy (Three Phase Technique). It is proved by finding  $t_o$  (3.662) is higher than T-table, whether in level significant 5% and 1%. It means that null hypothesis ( $H_o$ ) is rejected and alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is accepted.

## ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini berjudul “Pengaruh Strategi Think Pair Share terhadap Pemahaman Membaca Siswa pada Kelas 2 SMPN 1 Airtiris Kabupaten Kampar. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah ada perbedaan yang signifikan antara siswa-siswa yang diajarkan dengan menggunakan strategi Think Pair Share dan siswa-siswa yang diajarkan dengan menggunakan strategi Three Phase Technique pada kelas 2 SMPN 1 Airtiris Kabupaten Kampar.

Jenis penelitian ini adalah penelitian experiment dan disain penelitian adalah penelitian pre-experimental yang menggunakan kelas experiment dan kelas kontrol. Peneliti mengambil 2 kelas dari siswa kelas 2 SMPN 1 Airtiris sebagai sample. Kelas VIII A sebagai kelas kontrol dan kelas VIII B sebagai kelas experiment dengan menggunakan cluster random sampling. Jumlah kelas VIII A dan VIII B adalah 60 siswa. Kedua kelas ini dilakukan pretest diawal, perbedaan tindakan di pertengahan dan posttest diakhir penelitian. Hasil posttest dari kelas experiment dan kelas kontrol dibandingkan untuk mengetahui pengaruh dari tindakan.

Dalam penelitian ini, peneliti menggunakan tes sebagai alat untuk mengumpulkan data. Tes digunakan untuk menemukan bagaimana pemahaman membaca siswa pada teks narrative. Data dari penelitian ini adalah nilai dari pemahaman membaca siswa yang diperoleh dengan menggunakan tes membaca.

Dalam menganalisis data, peneliti menggunakan Standard Kelulusan (SKL) siswa dalam belajar bahasa inggris dikelas 2 SMPN 1 Airtiris Kabupaten Kampar. Standar Kelulusannya adalah 60 untuk pemahaman membaca siswa. Itu berarti siswa yang memperoleh nilai  $<60$  mereka tidak berhasil mencapai standard kelulusan, sementara mereka mereka yang memperoleh nilai  $>60$  berarti mereka berhasil mencapai Standard Kelulusan. Untuk menemukan apakah ada pengaruh ada pengaruh yang signifikan diantara pemahaman membaca siswa yang diajarkan dengan menggunakan strategi Think Pair Share dan pemahaman membaca siswa ang diajarkan dengan menggunakan conventional strategy (Three Phase Technique), data dianalisa secara statistic. Dalam menganalisis data, peneliti menggunakan nilai posttest kelas kontrol dan kelas experiment. Data dianalisa dengan menggunakan rumus independent sample T-test melalui SPSS 16.

Berdasarkan yang ditemukan peneliti menunjukkan bahwa ada pengaruh yang signifikan diantara pemahaman membaca siswa yang diajarkan dengan menggunakan strategi Think Pair Share dan pemahaman membaca siswa yang diajarkan dengan menggunakan strategi conventional strategy (Three Phase Technique). Hal itu dibuktikan dengan ditemukan T-o (3.662) adalah lebih tinggi dibandingkan dengan T-tabel, walaupun pada taraf significant 5% dan 1% ( $2,04 > 3.662 > 2,76$ ). Dengan demikian null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) ditolak, dan alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) diterima.

## الخلاصة

هذا التتبع أوالاء ستطى بالمعنوان : تأثير الطرق تنك فاير سير (Think Pair Share) تجاه فهم قراءة الطالب للسنة الفانية (SMPN 1) اى تريس منطقته كمفار, ومقصود عن هذ التتبع طعرفه هل يوازونه أوالاحاينة ألبيف أواقدة بين الطلاب الذين علموا بطرق تنك فايسير (Think rePair Sha) والطلاب الذين علموا بطرقيزوي فيس تيك نيفوى (Three Phase Technique) للسنة الفانية (SMPN 1) اى نى يس منطقة كمفار.

ونوع هذ التتبع, تتبع التجربة وهو تتبع قبل التجربة, وفيه قسم قسم للتجرب, وقسم قد مض لهم دراسة بطريقة فى حين (Control class) ومتتبع ياخذ طالين من السنة الدانية (SMPN 1) أى تريس متتبع والسنة (VIII A) جعل فى قسم قد مض لهم دراسة بطريقة فى حينها (Experiment class) والسنة (VIII B) جعل فى قسم الذى قصد للتجرب بكلو ستير راندام سمضليه (Cluster Random Sampling) وصحموكنه VIII B-VIII A 60 طالبا وكلا هذين الفصلين يجعل تجربته فى الأولى اى قبل أداء ذ لك التجرب زواللتبع أوالاء ستقراء, والحاصل عن كلا فصلين يقصد لرفة أثر الاء فعال.

وفي هذ التتبع يستخدم متتبع, التجربة, لجمع الملفات والتجرب يؤدى لإقبال على فهم قراءة الطالب تجاه نص ناراد (Narrative) وملفات عن هذ التتبع وهو الحاصل عن فهم قراءة الطالب الذى يحصل التجرب للقراءة وفي الاستقراء الملفات يستخدم متتبع بأن يضع حدودا للنجاح (SKL) فى تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية للسنة الثانية (SMPN 1) اير تريس منطقة كمفار وكان ذ لك الحدود 60 لفهم قراءة الطالب, وذ لك بمعنى, الطالب الذى حصل على الدرجة أقل من 60 لم ينجح, والطالب الذى حصل أكثر او تمام 60 ينجح, وذ لك لمعرفة هل له اثى ألبين او الدقة لفهم قراءة الطالب قبل التدريس بطرق تنك فايرسير (Think PairShare). مع فهم الطالب للقراءة بعد التدريس, وملفات يستقراء او تتبع بطريقة ستاتيستيك (Statistic) ويضع متتبع الدرجة بعد التجربة لكل فصلين, والملفات يستقراء بوضع القاعدة إندي فندن سمفيل نيس (Independent Sampel T-Test) من خلال (16SPSS)

١. التتبع متتبع يشير مع أن هذ الطرق لها تأثير البين والقة لفهم قراءة الطالب قبل التدريس بطرف تنك فايرسير مع فهم الطالب بعد التدريس, وذ لك بحصول (To 3.662) ارفع من (-T) غير أن فى حساب البين 5% و 1%. (2,04>3.662>2,76). وبذالك نول حيفواتيسيس (Null Hypothesis) مردود, ومخرج حيفواتيسيس مقبول.

## LIST OF CONTENT

<b>SUPERVISOR APPROVAL.....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>EXAMINER APPROVAL .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENT .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>LIST OF CONTENT .....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLE .....</b>	<b>xi</b>
 <b>CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION .....</b>	 <b>1</b>
A. The Background of the Problem.....	1
B. The Problem.....	4
1. The Identification of the Problem.....	4
2. The Limitation of the Problem .....	5
3. The Formulation of the Research .....	5
C. The Reason of Choosing the title.....	5
D. The Objective and the Significance of the Research .....	6
1. The Objective of the Research .....	6
2. The Significance of the Research .....	7
E. The Definition of Term.....	7
 <b>CHAPTER II LITERATURE RIVIEW .....</b>	 <b>9</b>
A. The Theoretical Framework.....	9
B. The Relevant Research .....	25
C. The Operational Concept .....	26
D. The Assumption and the Hypothesis .....	28
 <b>CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH .....</b>	 <b>29</b>
A. The Research Design .....	29
B. The Location and Time of the Research.....	30
C. The Subject and Object of the Research.....	30
D. The Population and Sample of the Research .....	30
E. The Technique of Collecting Data.....	31
F. The Technique of Data Analysis.....	31
G. The Reliability and the Validity of the Test .....	32
 <b>CHAPTER IV THE PRESENTATION OF THE DATA ANALYSIS .....</b>	 <b>36</b>
A. The Description of the Data .....	36
B. The Data Presentation.....	38
C. The Data Analysis.....	45

<b>CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION .....</b>	<b>54</b>
A. Conclusion .....	54
B. Suggestions .....	55
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>APPENDIX</b>	

## LIST OF TABLE

TABLE III. 1	Pre-experimental Design .....	29
TABLE III. 2	The Total Population of the Second Year Students of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency .....	30
TABLE IV. 1	The Score of Students' Reading Comprehension Taught by Using Think Pair Share Strategy .....	38
TABLE IV. 2	The Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Class .....	39
TABLE IV. 3	The Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental Class .....	40
TABLE IV. 4	The Score of Students' Reading Comprehension Taught by using Conventional Strategy .....	41
TABLE IV. 5	The Frequency Score of Pre-test and Post-test of Control Class .....	42
TABLE IV. 6	The Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-test and Post-test of Control Class .....	42
TABLE IV. 7	Mean and madian of Pre-test and Post-test Experiment Class and Control Class .....	43
TABLE IV.8	The Classification of Students' score .....	44
TABLE IV.9	Students' Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental and Control Class .....	44
TABLE IV.10	Students' Pre-test and Post-test Scores of Experimental Class	46
TABLE IV.11	Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-test Scores .....	47
TABLE IV.12	Mean and Standard Deviation of Post-test Scores .....	48
TABLE IV.13	Students' Pre-test and Post-test Scores of control Class ...	48
TABLE IV.14	Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-test Scores .....	49
TABLE IV.15	Mean and Standard Deviation of Post-test Scores .....	50



TABLE IV.16	Mean and Median of Post-test in Experimental Class and Control Class .....	51
TABLE IV. 17	Group Statistic.....	52
TABLE IV. 18	Independent Sample Test .....	52
TABLE IV.19	The mean Pre-test and Post-test of Experiment Class and Control Class .....	53

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### A. The Background of the Problem

Reading is one of the basic skills that the students should master them at the end of their learning process in educational levels. Reading is an essential part in learning language because reading provides multiple opportunities for students to study language, such as: vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, and the way to construct sentence, paragraph, and texts. Paulston and Bruder say that reading is the most important skill of all for most students of English throughout the world, it is a skill that has been neglected in the audio-lingual tradition of language teaching<sup>1</sup>. By reading we can communicate with other people through written because reading is an interactive process between language and mind. As interactive process, succesfull reading will be influenced by reading strategy.

According to school based curriculum (2006) pointed that in learning English, the students should be able to use language in communication either written or oral language in order to commemorate the global era”<sup>2</sup>. The purpose of reading in Junior High School, especially at the second year is that students should be able to

---

<sup>1</sup>Christina Bratt Paulston and Marry Newton Bruder.*Teaching English as a second Language : Techniques and Procedures*.(Cambidge:Winthrop Publisher,Inc,1976),p.157

<sup>2</sup>Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.*MODEL Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) SMP dan MTs*. (Solo: PT. Tiga Serangkai, 2006), p.13

understand and analyze the meaning of functional text such as recount, descriptive and narrative related to their environment. It is also relevant with the standard competence of reading in which students should be able to response the meaning in the short simple functional text accurately, fluently, and contextually. (Syllabus and Lesson Plan SMP)<sup>3</sup>.

SMPN I Airtiris of Kampar Regency uses school based curriculum (KTSP) as a guidance in arranging lesson plan, including reading skill. In this school, English is taught twice a week with duration of time 40 minutes for one meeting, school based curriculum (2006)<sup>4</sup>. It means that they have to learn English 160 minutes in a week. Teachers have used some strategy in teaching reading. Mostly, teachers have used Three Phase Technique. The first step is teacher explain the definition and generic structure of narrative text. The second, student try to identify generic structure include orientation, complication, and resolution. Then students translate the meaning into Indonesian. The last, students answer the question and try to identify communicative purpose. From the explanation above, it can be seen that students have learned reading maximally. Ideally, students are able to identify information, language features, and generic structure of narrative text. In short, students do not have any problems with their reading skill.

---

<sup>3</sup>Sillabus dan RPP SMP, (BSNP, 2007), P. 49 & 61

<sup>4</sup> Ibid, p. 12

In fact, based on the researcher's observation on January 6<sup>th</sup>, 2011 at Junior High School 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency, the writer found some problems faced by the students in learning reading. The first, students were not able to answer the question and find out the moral message from the narrative text because students did not understand yet the meaning of narrative text. It was caused by the limitation of student's vocabulary. Besides that, some of the students were not able to define the generic structure of narrative text, such as: most of the students did not have problem to find orientation, but some of them still had ambiguity to find complication and resolution. Furthermore students also had difficulty analyzing the language features mostly used in narrative text, such as: simple past, relative pronoun and adverb.

The problems faced by students can be described as follows :

1. Some of the students are not able to answer the questions in narrative text.
2. Some of the students are not able to find the communicative purpose in narrative text.
3. Some of the students have lack of vocabulary
4. Some of the students are not able to identify language features in narrative text.
5. Some of the students are not able to identify the generic structure of narrative text.

There is actually a strategy that can help teachers in teaching reading, it is called Think Pairs Share (TPS) strategy. Lyman (1981) says that the TPS strategy is a cooperative learning technique that encourages individual participation and is applicable across all grade levels and class sizes. Students think through questions using three distinct steps: think, pairs, and share<sup>5</sup>. With TPS students are given time to think through their own answer to the question before peers moves on. Students also have the opportunity to think aloud with other students about their responses before being asked to share their ideas publicly. This strategy provides an opportunity for all students to share their thinking with at least one another, it increases their sense of involvement in classroom learning. Researcher hopes that by using this strategy, students should be able to identify information, communicative purpose, language features, generic structure, and meaning of narrative text.

Based on the explanation and the problems experienced by the students above, the researcher is interested in conducting a research entitled: **“THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THINK PAIR SHARE STRATEGY TOWARD STUDENTS’ READING COMPREHENSION AT THE SECOND YEAR OF SMPN 1 AIRTIRIS OF KAMPAR REGENCY.**

## **B. The Problem**

---

<sup>5</sup>Lyman. *Think Pairs Share Strategies for Reading Comprehension*. (retrieved from [http://www.teachervision.fen.com/group-work/cooperative-learning/48547.html?page=2&detoured=1&for\\_printing=1](http://www.teachervision.fen.com/group-work/cooperative-learning/48547.html?page=2&detoured=1&for_printing=1), 1981 on June 24, 2010).

### **1. The Identification of the Problem**

Based on the explanation above, the researcher identifies the problems as follows:

1. Why are some of the students unable to answer the questions in narrative text?
2. Why are some of the students unable to find the communicative purpose in narrative text?
3. Why do some of the students have lack of vocabulary?
4. Why are some of the students unable to identify the language features of narrative text?
5. Why are some of students unable to identify the generic structure of narrative text?

### **2. The Limitation of the Problem**

Based on the identification of the problems above, the problem of the research is only focused on the effectiveness of Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy toward students' reading comprehension at the second year students of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar regency. Then, the reading text that was used by the researcher in this research is Narrative text.

### **3. The Formulation of the Research**

Based on the limitation of problem above, these research questions are formulated as follows:

1. How is students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy at the second year of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency?
2. How is students' reading comprehension who are taught by using conventional strategy at the second year of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency?
3. Is there any significant different between student's reading comprehension between who are taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy and those who are taught by using conventional strategy at the second year of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency?

### **C. The Reasons of Choosing the Title**

The reasons why the researcher is very interested in carrying out a research on the topic above are based on several considerations:

1. The researcher is very interested in carrying out this research to know the effectiveness of Think Pairs Share (TPS) strategy toward students' reading comprehension at the second year students of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar regency.
2. Think Pairs Share (TPS) strategy is a cooperative learning technique that encourages individual participation because students are given time to think through their own answer to the question. So, students do not cheat more in

doing their exercises because every student has his/her own answer and students are more active in the classroom.

3. This research is relevant to her status as English student of English Education Department of State Islamic University SUSKA Riau.
4. As far as the researcher is concerned, this research title has never been investigated by any researcher.

#### **D. The Objectives and the Significance of the Research**

##### **1. The Objectives of the Research**

- a. To find out students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy.
- b. To find out students' reading comprehension who are taught by using konvensional strategy.
- c. To find out whether there is significant different between students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy and those who are taught by using conventional strategy .

##### **2. The Significance of the Research**

Related to the objectives of the research above, the significance of the research is as follows:



- a. To give information to the teachers, and the institutions about the effectiveness of Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy toward students' reading comprehension in understanding narrative text
- b. To give some contributions to the students and teachers in order to improve students' reading comprehension in understanding narrative text.
- c. To fulfill one of the requirements to complete the undergraduate degree at Department of English Education and Teacher and Training Faculty of State Islamic University Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

## **E. The Definition of the Term**

### **1. Think Pair Share (TPS)**

According to Lyman (1981) the TPS strategy is a cooperative learning technique that encourages individual participation and is applicable across all grade levels and class sizes. Students think through questions using three distinct steps: think, pairs, and share<sup>6</sup>.

Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy meant in this research is a strategy used by researcher to know its effectiveness toward students' reading comprehension.

### **2. Reading Comprehension**

---

<sup>6</sup>Lyman. *Think Pairs Share Strategies for Reading Comprehension*. (retrieved from [http://www.teachervision.fen.com/group-work/cooperative-learning/48547.html?page=2&detoured=1&for\\_printing=1](http://www.teachervision.fen.com/group-work/cooperative-learning/48547.html?page=2&detoured=1&for_printing=1), 1981 on June 24, 2010)

Reading is the action of the person who reads or attempts to make a meaning from what an author has written. According to Ricahrd, reading comprehension is perceiving a written text in order to understand its content<sup>7</sup>.

In this study, reading comprehension is the capability of the second year students of Junior High School 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency in understanding or comprehending the reading text (narrative).

---

<sup>7</sup>Jack C. Richards and Richard Schmidt. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Third Edition (New York: Pearson Education, 2002) p. 306

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### A. The Theoretical Framework

##### 1. Nature of Reading

Based on the KTSP curriculum, reading is one of the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) that should be taught and learned<sup>1</sup>. The skill of reading is regarded as the backbone of other language skills. In the other words, through reading students can develop the other language skills such as writing and speaking and improve the language components as well, for instance vocabulary and grammar. This statement is supported by Harmer who states that reading text provides opportunity to study language: vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, and the way to construct sentence, paragraph, and texts<sup>2</sup>.

According to Paulston and Bruder, reading is the individual activity to get information excellent and unless there are contextual constraints on the teaching situation, such as lack of electricity in the houses, there is no sense in

---

<sup>1</sup>Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. *MODEL Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) SMP dan MTs*. (Solo: PT. Tiga Serangkai, 2006), p.13

<sup>2</sup>Jeremy Hammer. *How To Teach English* (Addison Wesley:Longman, 2000).p.68

wasting class time on actual reading<sup>3</sup>. Grabe in Walter states that reading is an interactive process, i.e., it is a dynamic instruction between the writer and the reader in which the reader creates meaning from the text by activating his store knowledge and extending it with the new information supplied by the text. In the other words, reading concentrated on the text-reader interaction<sup>4</sup>.

Bloom and Green in Walter view reading as a social process focusing on author-readers interaction. This approach to reading is rooted in the belief that readers construct the meaning of the texts within a culture<sup>5</sup>. Besides, Harmer states that reading is not a passive skill. To do it successfully, we have to understand what the words mean, see the pictures the words are painting, understand the arguments and work out if we agree with them<sup>6</sup>. In addition, Vellutino and Scanlon in Walter claim that reading is primarily a linguistic skills, it is the linguistic components of printed words that imbue them with meaning and substance. Additionally, they also claim that the competence in syntax facilitates the process of reading<sup>7</sup>.

Nuttal states that reading is an activity done to exact (to correct in every detail) meaning from writing. It is the way the reader gets message

---

<sup>3</sup>Christina Bratt Jaulston & Mary Newton Bruder. *Teaching English as A Second Language Techniques and Procedures*. (Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers, Inc), p. 64

<sup>4</sup>Walter de gruyter. *Current Trends in the Development and Teaching of The Four Language Skills*. (Berlin : Library Of Congress Cataloging), p. 265

<sup>5</sup>Ibid, p.266

<sup>6</sup>Jeremy Harmer. *How to Teach English*. (Addison Wesley:Longman, 2000), p. 70

<sup>7</sup>Walter de gruyter, Op.Cit., p. 357-358

from a text by having interaction between perception of graphic symbols that represent language and the reader's language skills, cognitive skills and the knowledge of the world<sup>8</sup>.

Furthermore, Mariane and Murcia states that reading is to learn unique thinking skill in which ESL/ EFL learners must have ability to comprehend the material from a text by using their own thought activities which help them to analyze the text, determine the main idea and contrast or cause and effect examples, following and argument in the text, choose relevant topic under discussion<sup>9</sup>.

Based on the definition above, it can be conclude that reading is a way to get information from something that was written. Reading is an active and interactive activity to reproduce the word mentally and vocally and tries to understand the content of reading text. Reading involves the interaction between reader and the passage. The definition is also supported by Kathleen, she gave list examples of successful active reading strategies and contrast them with passive (unsuccessful) approaches as follows<sup>10</sup>:

**Table.1. Active versus passive reading**

No	Active readers	Passive readers
1	Read each assignment differently	Read all the assignment the same way

<sup>8</sup>Christine Nuttal. *Teaching Reading Skill in a Foreign Language*. (New York: Mc Grow Hill Book Company, 1982), p. 4

<sup>9</sup>Celce Mariane and Lois Murcia. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. (Newbury: House Publisher, 1979), p. 200

<sup>10</sup>Kathleen T. Mcwhorter. *Efficient and Flexible Reading*. (Harper Collin: Niagara country) p.24

2	Analyze the purpose of an assignment	Read an assignment because it was assigned
3	Adjust their speed to suit their purpose	Read everything at the same speed
4	Question ideas	Accept whatever is in print as true
5	Compare and connect textbook reading with lecture content	Study each separately
6	Find out what an assignment is about before reading it	Check the length of an assignment before reading it
7	Keep track of their level of comprehension and concentration	Read until assignment is complete
8	Read with pencil in hand, highlighting, jotting notes, and marking key vocabulary	Read

Moreover Kathleen states that reading is not a single-step process (open the book, read, and close the book, but a complex set of skills involving activity before, during, and after reading, here is a partial list of some of those skills<sup>11</sup>.

a) Before reading

1. Determining the subject of the material
2. Determining how the material is organized
3. Deciding what you need to remember from the material
4. Defining your purpose for reading

b) During reading

1. Identifying what is important
2. Determining how key ideas are supported
3. Identifying patterns of thought

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid, p. 23-24

4. Drawing connection among ideas
  5. Anticipating what is to come next
  6. Relating ideas to what you already know
- c) After reading
1. Identifying the author's purpose for writing
  2. Analyzing the writer's technique and language
  3. Evaluating the writer's competence or authority
  4. Asking critical questions
  5. Evaluating the nature and type of supporting idea evidence

There are many purpose of reading as follows<sup>12</sup>:

1. For pleasure or for personal reasons,
2. To find personal information such as what book is mostly about,
3. To find a specific topic in a book or article,
4. To learn subject matter that is required for a class.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher can conclude that different people will have different purpose why she/ he reading. It depends on who is reading.

## **2. Teaching Reading comprehension**

---

<sup>12</sup>Delene Sholes. *Reading for Different Purposes: Strategies for Reading Different Kinds of Materials*. ( Retrieved from <http://www.suite101.com/content/reading-for-different-purposes-a91899> on April 12, 2010), p. 2

According to Olson and Diller in Anteng, what is meant by reading comprehension is a term used to identify those skills needed to understand and apply information contained in a written material<sup>13</sup>. This statement is supported by Haris and Sipay, who say that reading comprehension ability is taught to be set of generalized knowledge acquisition skills that permits people to acquire and exhibit information gained as a sequence of reading printed language<sup>14</sup>.

Judith states that reading comprehension is the process in which reader understands and selectively recall idea in individual sentence (microprocesses), understand and/or infer relationships between classes and/or sentences (integrative processes). Organized and synthesize the recalled ideas into general ideas (macroprocesses), and make inferences not necessarily intended by the author (elaborative processes). The reader control and adjust these processes according to intermediate goal (metacognitive processes). All these processes occur virtually simultaneously, constantly interacting with each other (interactive processes)<sup>15</sup>.

---

<sup>13</sup>Anteng Ria.A. The Teaching of Reading Comprehension by Using a Small Group Discussion at the First Year Students Of SMP 1 Wanadadi In The Academic Year Of 2006/2007 (Semarang :Unpublished, 2007) p. 9

<sup>14</sup>Ibid, p. 9

<sup>15</sup>Judith Westphal Irwin. *Teaching Reading Comprehension Process*. (USA: Prentice-Hall, 1986), p.3-7



Based on the definition above, there are at least five processes proceeding simultaneously during reading comprehension. Each of these processes involves a variety of subprocesses, it can be described as follows:

1. Microprocesses

Microprocessing is the initial chunking and selective recall of individual idea units within individual sentences. It has two processing skills required for understanding of individual sentences, they are:

- a. Chunking: the ability to group words into meaningful phrases and involves a basic understanding syntax and its use in written language.
- b. The ability to select what idea units to remember.

2. Integrative processes

Integrative processing is the process of understanding and inferring the relationship between individual clauses and/or sentences. Integrative processing requires the ability to do such thing as identifying pronoun referents, inferring causation and sequence, and making other relevant inferences about the total situation being described.

3. Macroprocesses

Macroprocessing is the process of synthesizing and organizing individual idea units into a summary or organized series of related general ideas. At least two skills are necessary for macroprocessing:

- a. The ability to select the general ideas and to summarize the passage.
- b. The ability to use the author's general organizational pattern to organize one's own memory representation.

4. Elaborative processes

Elaborative processing is the process of making inferences, not necessarily intended by the author.

5. Metacognitive processes

Metacognition is defined as conscious awareness and control of one's own cognitive processes. The process of adjusting one's strategies to control comprehension and long term recall can be called metacognitive processing. Rehearsing, reviewing, underlining, and note taking are all metacognitive processes that facilitate remembering.

All of these processes above should occur virtually simultaneously, constantly interacting with each other (interactive process). In other words these process do not occur separately.

Swanson and Sharon point out some of the instructional components that contribute the most improving affected size in reading comprehension that includes<sup>16</sup>:

- a. Teacher and student questioning
- b. Interactive dialogue between teacher and students and students and students
- c. Controlling task activity and scaffolding interaction elaboration of steps or strategies and modeling by the teacher
- d. Small group instruction
- e. Use of cues to help students remember to use and apply what they learn

There are two components that should be known by the teacher in teaching reading. They are reading skill and reading comprehension. According to Celce and Murcia, the reading comprehension component are intensive and extensive reading, reading material, cultural issues and testing<sup>17</sup>. Additionally Pearson and Pressley in Graves recommended nine keys of reading comprehension strategies as follows<sup>18</sup>:

- a. Establishing a purpose for reading
- b. Using prior knowledge

---

<sup>16</sup>Sharon Vaughn. *Teaching Reading Comprehension to Students with Learning Difficulties* (New York: The Guildford Press, 2007) p. 5

<sup>17</sup>Celce Mariane and Lois Murcia. *Teaching English as a Second or Forign Language*. (Newbury: House Publisher, 1979), p. 150-152

<sup>18</sup>Michael F. Graves. *Teaching Reading in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. (Botton: Allyn and Bacon Press) p. 310

- c. Asking and answering questions
- d. Making inferences
- e. Determining what is important
- f. Summarizing
- g. Dealing with graphic information
- h. Imaging and creating graphic representations
- i. Monitoring comprehension

The nine key strategies above is core point in teaching reading comprehension to students. It can guide us how to teach reading comprehension well and effective in the class, so we can teach reading comprehension maximally to the students.

### **3. Cooperative Learning**

Cooperative learning, sometimes called small group learning, is an instructional strategy in which small groups of students work together on a common task. According to david and roger (1999), there are five basic elements that allow successful cooperative learning:

- a. Positive interdependence: students feel responsible for their own and group's effect.
- b. Face to face interaction: students encourage and support one another; the environment encourages discussion and eye contact.

- c. Individual and group accountability: each student is responsible for doing their part; the group is accountable for meeting its goal
- d. Group behaviors: group members gain direct instruction in the interpersonal, social, and collaborative skills needed to work with other occurs.
- e. Group processing: group members analyze their own and the group's ability to work together.

#### **4. Think Pair Share (TPS) Strategy**

##### **a. The definition of Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy**

According to Lyman, The think, pair, share strategy is a cooperative learning technique that encourages individual participation and is applicable across all grade levels and class sizes. Students think through questions using three distinct steps<sup>19</sup>:

1. Think: Provide students with a question, prompt, or observation that reflects an important standard from the day's lesson. Give students a few moments to silently think about the question. Be careful not to make this time too lengthy. You want students to focus and just quietly think. Students can also jot down notes or drawings to illustrate their thinking.

---

<sup>19</sup>Richard I. Arends, *Learning to Teach: Belajar untuk Mengajar*. (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar). p 15-16.

2. Pair: Pair students with partner. During this time, students take turns sharing ideas with partners. They compare ideas and create one best answer. The answer should be the one they consider most interesting.
3. Share: Call on pairs to share their thinking.

The definition above is supported by Douglas, he states that TPS will help English Language Learners and struggling readers better comprehend what they read. TPS strategy works well with English Language Learners because it allows them to formulate their ideas on their own, test them out in a non-threatening way with their partners, then reinforced by their partners feedback, share their ideas with the class. They can thus rehearse what they want to say before they say it in front of a large group. It also lets them work out meaning with their partners, expanding and possibly correcting what they gathered from the reading<sup>20</sup>.

Jones in Preszler writes on his Reading Ques.org web site that Think Pair Share helps structure discussion and decrease off-task time, thinking and behavior. Various elements contribute all students to participate in the Think Pair Share process<sup>21</sup>:

---

<sup>20</sup>Ellen Douglas. *Reading Comprehension Strategies For English Language Learners*. (retrieved from <http://www.learnnc.org/lp/pages/724> on January 26, 2011)

<sup>21</sup>June Preszler. *On Target: Strategies That Differentiate Instruction Grades K-4*. (Dakota : Black Hills Special Services Cooperative) p.12-13

1. The question, observation, or prompt leads to focus on thinking by all students-not just the students who participate in classroom discussions.
2. The process has a built-in safety factor for reluctant learners or shy students. They get to “practice” their thinking with a partner before sharing their thoughts with the entire class.
3. The strategy encourages a deeper level of thinking since students have to communicate their ideas to at least one other person –their partner.
4. When teachers take care not to invest too much time in the first two steps, students’ involvement increase. Although it should not be stressed by the quick pace, they should feel the need to focus and quickly come up with ideas. Misbehavior or side conversations by students are indicators that too much time is being allotted to each step.

**b. The Procedure in Teaching Activities**

I will describe the procedures in teaching and learning process, as follows:

1. Lead-in
  - a. Greetings, praying, and checking students’ attendance list
  - b. Telling students about the objectives of study and giving motivation

## 2. Presentation and Practice

- a. Students into some groups, each group consists of four students. The students work cooperatively.
- b. Gives the example of narrative text to the students.
- c. Students are posed questions based on reading passage.
- d. Asks students read silently the reading passage. During this step, individuals though silently about the questions posed by the teacher.
- e. Asks students sit with their partners by using student's numbers. (Example: for this discussion, student 1 and 2 will be partners. At the same time, student 3 and 4 will talk over their ideas.)
- f. Students sit with their pairs and exchange thoughts for 15 minutes about their own answer.
- g. The pairs are given 30 minutes to share their responses with other pairs, other teams or the entire group randomly.

## 3. Production and Evaluation

- a. Teacher asks the difficulties of understanding the lesson
- b. Teacher asks to students about unfamiliar word in the text
- c. Students submit their assignment



**c. The purpose of Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy<sup>22</sup>**

1. Providing "think time" increases quality of student responses.
2. Students become actively involved in thinking about the concepts presented in the lesson.
3. Research tells us that we need time to mentally "chew over" new ideas in order to store them in memory. When teachers present too much information all at once, much of that information is lost. If we give students time to "think-pair-share" throughout the lesson, more of the critical information is retained.
4. When students talk over new ideas, they are forced to make sense of those new ideas in terms of their prior knowledge. Their misunderstandings about the topic are often revealed (and resolved) during this discussion stage.
5. Students are more willing to participate since they don't feel the peer pressure involved in responding in front of the whole class.
6. Think-Pair-Share is easy to use on the spur of the moment.
7. Easy to use in large classes.

**d. Uses for Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy<sup>23</sup>**

---

<sup>22</sup>Saskatoon Public Schools (retrieved from <http://olc.spsd.sk.ca/DE/PD/instr/strats/think/> on 24 June, 2010)

<sup>23</sup>Saskatoon Public Schools (retrieved from <http://olc.spsd.sk.ca/DE/PD/instr/strats/think/> on 24 June, 2010)

TPS strategy is used for Note check, Vocabulary review, Quiz review, reading comprehension, reading check, Concept review, Lecture check, Outline, Discussion questions, Partner reading, Topic development, Agree/Disagree, Brainstorming, Simulations, Current events opinion, Conceding to the opposition, Summarize, Develop an opinion

**e. Hints and Management Ideas<sup>24</sup>**

**1. Assign Partners**

Be sure to assign discussion partners rather than just saying "Turn to a partner and talk it over." When you don't assign partners, students frequently turn to the most popular student and leave the other person out.

**2. Change Partners**

Switch the discussion partners frequently. With students seated in teams, they can pair with the person beside them for one discussion and the person across from them for the next discussion.

**3. Give Think Time**

---

<sup>24</sup>Saskatoon Public Schools (retrieved from <http://olc.spsd.sk.ca/DE/PD/instr/strats/think/on> 24 June, 2010)

Be sure to provide adequate "think time." I generally have students give me a thumbs-up sign when they have something they are ready to share.

#### 4. Monitor Discussions

Walk around and monitor the discussion stage. You will frequently hear misunderstandings that you can address during the whole-group discussion that follows.

#### 5. Timed-Pair-Share

If you notice that one person in each pair is monopolizing the conversation, you can switch to "Timed-Pair-Share." In this modification, you give each partner a certain amount of time to talk. (For example, say that Students #1 and #3 will begin the discussion. After 60 seconds, call time and ask the others to share their ideas.)

Rallyrobin - If students have to list ideas in their discussion, ask them to take turns. (For example, if they are to name all the geometric shapes they see in the room, have them take turns naming the shapes. This allows for more equal participation.) The structure variation name is Rallyrobin (similar to Rallytable, but kids are talking instead of taking turns writing).

#### 6. Randomly Select Students

During the sharing stage at the end, call on students randomly. You can do this by having a jar of popsicle sticks that have student names or numbers on them. (One number for each student in the class, according to their number on your roster.) Draw out a popsicle stick and ask that person to tell what their partner said. The first time you do this, expect them to be quite shocked! Most kids don't listen well, and all they know is what they said! If you keep using this strategy, they will learn to listen to their partner.

#### 7. Questioning

Think-Pair-Share can be used for a single question or a series of questions.

#### **f. Teachers benefit**

Students spend more time on task and listen to each other more when engaged in Think-Pair-Share activities. More students are willing to respond in large groups after they have been able to share their responses in pairs. The quality of students responses also improves.

As a Cooperative Learning strategy, Think-Pair-Share also benefits students in the areas of peer acceptance, peer support, academic achievement, self-esteem, and increased interest in other students and school.

## **B. The Relevant Research**

According to Syafi'i, relevant research is required to observe some previous researchers conducted by other researchers in which they are relevant to our research<sup>25</sup>. Besides, we have to analyze what the point is focused on inform design, found and conclude in the previous research:

### **1. Research from Hairul Akmal**

In 2009, Hairul conducted a research entitled "Penerapan Strategy Cooperative Learning Tipe Think Pair Share untuk Meningkatkan Motivasi Belajar Pkn Siswa Kelas III MI Darrussalam Kualu Nenas Kecamatan Tambang". The research method which was used in this research was action research. From the research, he found that Penerapan Strategy Cooperative Learning Tipe Think Pair Share untuk Meningkatkan Motivasi Belajar Pkn Siswa Kelas III MI Darrussalam Kualu Nenas Kecamatan Tambang" hypothesis was accepted because students' motivation percentage in cycle I was 66% and student's percentage in cycle II was 84%. Thus it can be seen that students' motivation rose from 66% to 84%, it rose 18%. It means that there is significance increasing students' motivation by using Think Pair Share strategy.

### **2. Research from Anteng Ria A.**

---

<sup>25</sup>M. Syafi'i. S. *From Paragraph to a Research Report: a Writing of English for Academic Purposes*. (Pekanbaru: Lembaga Bimbingan Belajar Syaf Intensive/ LBSI, 2007). p. 122

In 2007, Anteng conducted a research entitled “The Teaching Of Reading Comprehension By Using Small Group Discussion At The First Year Students of SMP 1 Wanadadi In The Academic Year Of 2006/2007”. The student’s pretest score was 184 or put in percentage their reading comprehension ability was 61.3% and the student’s post test score using the small group discussion was 231 or in percentage their reading comprehension ability was 77%. Thus it can be seen that student’s score rose from 184 to 231. In other words, it rose 15.7%. The small group discussion teaching strategy in reading comprehension class of EFL students could be an effective method. It has proper since there was a significance difference between the control group and the experimental group when the study was conducted.

### **C. Operational Concept**

Operational concept is a concept as a guidance used to avoid misunderstanding toward the research. It should be interpreted into particular words in order to make it easy to measure. The explanation is to describe the concept used by the researcher.

In order to clarify the theories used in this research, the researcher would like to explain briefly about variable of this research. This research is experimental research which focuses on gaining the effectiveness of Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy toward students’ reading comprehension. Therefore, in analyzing the

problem in this research, there are two variables used. The first is Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy which refers to the teacher's strategy in teaching reading. The second is students' reading comprehension. Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy is an independent variable and students' reading comprehension is a dependent variable. To operate the investigation on the variable, the researcher works based on the following indicators:

A. The teaching procedure by using Think Pair Share strategy in the classroom are as follows<sup>26</sup>:

1. Students divide into some groups, each group consists of four students.  
The students work cooperatively.
2. Gives the example of narrative text to the students.
3. Students are posed questions based on reading passage.
4. Asks students read silently the reading passage for 15 minutes. During this step, individuals though silently about a question posed by the teacher.
5. Asks students to sit with their partners by using students' numbers.  
(Example: for this discussion, student 1 and 2 will be a partner.)
6. Students sit with their pairs and exchange thoughts for 15 minutes.
7. The pairs are given time 30 minutes to share their responses with other pairs, other teams or entire groups randomly.

---

<sup>26</sup> Lyman. *Think Pairs Share Strategies for Reading Comprehension*. (retrieved from [http://www.teachervision.fen.com/group-work/cooperative-learning/48547.html?page=2&detoured=1&for\\_printing=1,1981](http://www.teachervision.fen.com/group-work/cooperative-learning/48547.html?page=2&detoured=1&for_printing=1,1981) on June 24, 2010).

B. The indicators of student's reading comprehension in narrative text are as follows:

1. The students are able to answer the question from narrative text.
2. The students are able to identify language features of narrative text.
3. The students are able to memorize unfamiliar vocabulary in narrative text.
4. The students are able to find generic structure of narrative text correctly.
5. The students are able to find communicative purpose of narrative text and comprehend the text meaningfully.

#### **D. Assumption and Hypothesis**

##### **1. The Assumption**

In this research, the researcher would like to present assumptions as follows:

- a. By having appropriate strategy, teaching reading comprehension is more efficient and effective in the classroom and makes students better comprehend about the reading text.
- b. Teaching strategy can influence different ability in understanding the reading text.



## **2. The Hypothesis**

$H_0$ : There is no significant difference between students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy and those who are taught by using conventional strategy.

$H_a$ : There is a significant difference between students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy and those who are taught by using conventional strategy.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

#### A. Research Design

The type of the research is an experimental research. According to Gay and Airaisian, experimental research is “the only type of the research that can test hypotheses to establish cause-and-effect relationship”<sup>1</sup>. Then, Cresswell states that experiment is that you test an idea (or practice or procedure) to determine whether or not it influences an outcome or dependent variable. The design of this research is pre-experimental design, which uses experimental class and control class<sup>2</sup>. In conducting this research, two classes of second year students of SMPN 1 Airtiris were participated. Both groups were administered a pretest at the beginning, different treatment in the middle and posttest at the end of the research. The pretest and posttest results were compared in order to determine the effect of the treatment. According to Sukardi, the design of this research can be illustrated as follows<sup>3</sup>:

---

<sup>1</sup>L.R. Gay and Peter Airasian. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application. Six Ed.* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc, 2000), pp.367

<sup>2</sup>Jhon. W. Cresswell. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research.* (New Jersey: pearson education, 2008), p. 299

<sup>3</sup>Prof. Sukardi, Ph. D. *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan.* (Jakarta: Bumi Aksara, 2008), p. 184

**Table.III.1. PRE-EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN**

<b>Class</b>	<b>Pretest</b>	<b>Treatment</b>	<b>Posttest</b>
E	T1	X	<b>T2</b>
C	T1	-	<b>T2</b>

**B. Location and Time of the Research**

The research was conducted at the second year students of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency. The research was done 6 weeks, starting from on May until June 2011.

29

**C. Subject and Object of the Research**

Subject of the research was the second year students of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency. The object of the research was the effectiveness of Think Pair share (TPS) strategy toward students' reading comprehension.

**D. Population and Sample of the Research**

The population of this research was the second year students of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency in 2010-2011 academic years. The number of the second year students of SMPN 1 Airtiris was 240 students. They were divided in to eight different classes of class VIII A, VIII B, VIII C, VIII D, VIII E, VIII F, VIII G, and VIII H.

**Table III. 2**

**THE TOTAL POPULATION OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF  
SMPN 1 Airtiris 2010-2011**

<b>No</b>	<b>Class</b>	<b>Total</b>
1	VIII A	30
2	VIII B	30
3	VIII C	30
4	VIII D	30
5	VIII E	30
6	VIII F	30
7	VIII G	30
8	VIII H	30
<b>Total</b>		<b>240</b>

The population above was large enough to be taken all as sample of the research. Based on the design of the research, the researcher took only two classes as the sample of this research. The class was VIII A and VIII B by using cluster-random sampling. The number of class VIII A and VIII B was 60 students. Thus, the researcher chose students of VIII A to be control class and students of VIII B to be experimental class.

**E. Technique of Collecting Data**

In this research, the researcher used test as instrument to collect data. The test was used to find out the students' reading comprehension in narrative text. The data of this research were the score of the students' reading comprehension obtained by using reading test. The test was done twice, the first was pre-test given before treatment and the second was posttest given after treatment, intended to obtain

students' reading comprehension at the second year of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency.

## **F. Technique of Data Analysis**

In order to analyze students' reading comprehension in narrative text, the researcher used graduated standard of English lesson in SMPN 1 Airtiris (SKL) that was 60 for students' reading comprehension in narrative text, it means for those who get score  $< 60$ , they did not pass graduated standard (SKL), while for those who get score  $\geq 60$ , they passed the graduated standard (SKL).

In order to find out whether there is a significant different between students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share Strategy and those are taught by using Think Pair Share Strategy, the data were analyzed statistically. In analyzing the data, the researcher used score of control class and experiment class. The different mean was analyzed by using T-test formula through using SPSS 16 Version.

The t-test was obtained by considering the degree of freedom (df) as follows:<sup>4</sup>

$$df = N-1$$

$$N = \text{Number of cases}$$

Statistically the hypotheses are:

$$H_o : t_o < t\text{-table}$$

$$H_a : t_o \geq t\text{-table}$$

---

<sup>4</sup> Hartono. *Statistik untuk Penelitian*. (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2008), pp. 191

$H_0$  is accepted if  $t_o < t_{table}$  or there is no significant different between students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share Strategy and those who are taught by using conventional strategy .

$H_a$  is accepted if  $t_o \geq t_{table}$  or there is significant different between students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share Strategy and those who are taught by using conventional strategy .

## **G. The Validity and Reliability of the test**

### **1. Validity**

Every test, whether it is short, informal classroom test or a public examination should be as valid as the test constructor can make it. The test must aim to provide a true measure of the particular skill in which it is intended to measure.

Heaton states that the validity of a test refers to appropriateness of a given test or any of its component parts as measure of what it is purposed to measure. It means the test will be valid to the extent that is measured what it is supposed to measure. There are three kinds of validity that consist of content validity, construct validity and empirical validity<sup>5</sup>.

In order to obtain the data about the comparison between student's reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS)

---

<sup>5</sup> J.B Heaton. *Writing English Language Test*. (New York: Longman Group UK Limited, 1988), p. 159

strategy and Conventional strategy on reading comprehension, the researcher acquired to show each score. It was used pertaining to the most important characteristic of an item to be accurately determined by its difficulty. Then, the test given to students was considered too difficult or too easy often show the low reliability. Item difficulty is determined as the proportion of correct responses. This is held pertinent to the index difficulty, in which it is generally expressed as the percentage of the students who answer the questions correctly. The formula for item difficulty is as follows:

$$FV = \frac{R}{N}$$

Where:

FV : index of difficulty of facility value

R : the number of correct answer

N : the number of examinees or students taking the test

Heaton<sup>6</sup>

The formula above is used to find out the easy or difficulties of each item test that researcher gives to the respondents. The items that do not reach the standard level of difficulty are excluding from the test and they were rejected.

---

<sup>6</sup> Heaton, *Ibid*, p. 179

## 2. Reliability

According to H. Douglas Brown<sup>7</sup> reliability has to do with accuracy of measurement. This kind of accuracy is reflected in the obtaining of similar results when measurement is repeated on different occasions or with different instruments or by different persons. The characteristic of reliability is sometimes termed consistency. Meaning that, the test is reliable when an examinee's results are consistent on repeated measurement. To obtain the reliability of the test, it must be known the Mean and Standard Deviation of test.

The validity and reliability was relation. It was possible for a test to be reliable without being valid for a specified purpose, but it was impossible a test to be valid without first being reliable.

The reliability coefficients for good student's reading comprehension test are expected to exceed 0.0 and closed 1.00. Heaton (1995: 16) states that, the reliability of the test is considered as follows:

1. 0.00– 0.20 Reliability is low
2. 0.21 – 0.40 Reliability is sufficient
3. 0.41 – 0.70 Reliability is high
4. > 0.70 Reliability is very high

---

<sup>7</sup> H. Douglas Brown. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. (New York: Pearson Education Inc, 2003) pp. 19-27



To know the reliability of the test, we should know: (a) the mean score, (b) the standard deviation of the test, and (c) Cronbach's Alpha. The researcher used the SPSS 16.0 for windows-statistical software.

#### Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.538	.582	2

#### Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
T1	67.3300	5.89733	30
T2	62.0000	9.49047	30

From the table above, it can be seen cronbach's alpha was 0.538. It means that the reliability is high categorized because the result of reliability is  $0.538 < 0.70$ .

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **THE DATA PRESENTATION AND THE DATA ANALYSIS**

#### **A. Description of Research Procedure**

The purpose of the research is to obtain the students' reading comprehensions who are taught by using Think Pair Share strategy and those who are taught by using conventional strategy, and to know whether there is significant different between the students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share strategy and those who are taught by using conventional strategy. The data were obtained from students' reading comprehension of experimental and control class. Before taking the data from the sample, the researcher tried one of the second class in order to prove whether the test was reliable or not. The result found in the try out was 0.538. It means that the test was high reliable. Then, to obtain the homogeneity and normality of students' reading comprehension, the researcher gave pre-test and post-test to VIII A and VIII B. The researcher asked the students to answer some questions based on the text given; the text was a narrative text. Based on design of the research, it was found that class VIII A was as control class and VIII B was as experimental class. Then, the researcher gave treatments to experimental class for eight meetings.

After giving treatments to experimental class, the researcher used the same format of questions and text of narrative to test students' reading comprehension for the post-test of experimental class. While for control class, which were taught without using treatments, the researcher used the same format of questions of narrative for

their post-test also. The result of reading test was evaluated by concerning five components, such as:

- a. Students are able to identify information in narrative text.
- b. Students are able to identify the communicative purpose of narrative text.
- c. Students are able to identify generic structure of narrative text.
- d. Students are able to identify language features of narrative text.
- e. Students are able to memorize unfamiliar words which always use in narrative text.

The data of this research were gotten from the score of students' of experimental class and control class. All of data were collected through the following procedures:

1. In Both classes (experimental and control group), students were asked to answer the questions based on the narrative text given.
2. The format of the test was multiple choice.
3. The researcher together with the observer gave a score of the students' reading comprehension that was collected from their score of pre-test and post-test.

The test was composed of 30 items, and each item was given score 3.333. The final score was analyzed by using the following formula<sup>1</sup>:

$$\text{Final score} = \frac{\text{Total Correct Answer}}{\text{Total Questioner}} \times 100$$

---

<sup>1</sup> Anas Sudijono. *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan*. (Jakarta: PT. Rajafindo Persada, 2008) pp. 32

## **B. The Data Presentation**

The data of the research is taken from student's reading comprehension who are taught by using conventional strategy and those who are taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy, they were:

### **1. Data presentation of students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy**

The data of students' reading comprehension taught by using Think Pair share strategy were gotten from pre-test and post-test of VIII B as an experimental class taken from the sample of this class (30 students). The researcher taught directly for eight meetings in the experimental class. The data can be seen from the table below:

**Table IV. 1**  
**The score of the students' reading comprehension taught by using**  
**Think Pair Share strategy**

No.	Students	Experimental Class		Gain
		Pre-Test	Post-Test	
1	Student 1	73	93	20
2	Student 2	57	66	9
3	Student 3	70	90	20
4	Student 4	53	66	13
5	Student 5	43	57	-4
6	Student 6	57	70	-13
7	Student 7	63	70	7
8	Student 8	70	87	17
9	Student 9	63	80	17
10	Student 10	43	60	17
11	Student 11	70	77	7
12	Student 12	57	70	13
13	Student 13	63	70	7
14	Student 14	53	60	7

15	Student 15	57	63	6
16	Student 16	66	77	11
17	Student 17	70	73	-3
18	Student 18	50	60	10
19	Student 19	57	77	20
20	Student 20	63	77	14
21	Student 21	80	90	10
22	Student 22	53	63	10
23	Student 23	60	73	13
24	Student24	73	87	14
25	Student 25	66	77	11
26	Student 26	73	77	4
27	Student 27	77	73	-4
28	Student 28	53	70	17
29	Student 29	70	80	10
30	Student 30	57	73	16
<b>Total</b>		<b>1860</b>	<b>2206</b>	

From the table IV.1, the researcher found that the total score of pre test in experimental group was 1860 while the highest was 80 and the lowest was 43 and the total score of post- test in experimental group was 2206 while the highest was 93 and the lowest was 57. It means that the students have significant increasing of their reading comprehension, it proved by the total score and the score of frequency from pretest and post test which is significantly different, and it can be seen as below:

**Table IV. 2**  
**The frequency score of pre test and post test of experimental group**

<b>Valid of Pre-Test</b>	<b>Frequency of Pre-Test</b>	<b>Valid of Post-Test</b>	<b>Frequency of Post-test</b>
43	2	43	-
50	1	50	-
53	4	53	-
57	6	57	1

60	1	60	3
63	4	63	2
66	2	66	2
70	5	70	4
73	3	73	2
77	1	77	6
80	1	80	2
87	-	87	2
90	-	90	2
93	-	93	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>30</b>

Besides, the mean and standard deviation are also needed in analyzing data which was gotten from the score of pre test and post test. In determining the mean and standard deviation, the writer used the software SPSS 16 to calculate it. The mean and standard deviation of pre test and post test are as in the following table:

**Table IV. 3**  
**The mean and standard deviation of pre test and post test**  
**of experimental group**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev</b>
<b>Pre-Test</b>	62.00	9.49
<b>Post-Test</b>	73.53	9.58

From the table above, the distance between Mean (M<sub>x</sub>) and Standart Deviation ( $\delta$ ) is too far. In other word, the scores obtain are normal.

## **2. Students' Reading Comprehension Taught by Using Conventional Strategy**

The data of students' reading comprehension by using Conventional strategy were also taken from pre-test and post-test of VIII A as control class taken from the sample of this class (30 students). The data can be seen from the table below:

**Table IV. 4**  
**The score of the students' reading comprehension taught by using conventional strategy**

No.	Students	Control Class		Gain
		Pre-Test	Post-Test	
1	Student 1	70	70	0
2	Student 2	53	63	10
3	Student 3	70	60	-9
4	Student 4	50	50	0
5	Student 5	63	66	3
6	Student 6	60	57	-3
7	Student 7	66	70	4
8	Student 8	63	66	3
9	Student 9	66	63	-3
10	Student 10	73	70	-3
11	Student 11	53	57	4
12	Student 12	43	57	14
13	Student 13	63	70	7
14	Student 14	63	73	10
15	Student 15	66	70	4
16	Student 16	50	60	10
17	Student 17	50	57	7
18	Student 18	50	60	10
19	Student 19	53	60	7
20	Student 20	66	70	4
21	Student 21	70	50	-20
22	Student 22	53	50	-3
23	Student 23	77	80	3
24	Student 24	63	60	-3
25	Student 25	63	66	3
26	Student 26	50	63	13
27	Student 27	66	63	-3
28	Student 28	66	66	0
29	Student 29	43	60	17
30	Student 30	70	60	-10
<b>Total</b>		<b>1812</b>	<b>1887</b>	



From the table IV.4, The writer found that the total score of pre test in control group was 1812 while the highest was 77 and the lowest was 43 and the total score of post-test in control group was 1887 while the highest was 80 and the lowest was 50.

It means that the students have little increasing of their reading comprehension, and it is not as experimental class. Besides, the mean of pre test and post test of control group and experimental group also have a big different. The frequency score and the mean of pre test and post test of control group can be seen as below:

**Table IV. 5**  
**The frequency score of pre test and post test of control group**

<b>Valid of Pre-Test</b>	<b>Frequency of Pre-Test</b>	<b>Valid of Post-Test</b>	<b>Frequency of Post-test</b>
43	2	43	-
47	-	47	-
50	5	50	3
53	4	53	-
57	-	57	4
60	1	60	7
63	6	63	4
66	6	66	4
70	4	70	6
73	1	73	1
77	1	77	-
80	-	80	1
87	-		
Total	30		30

**Table IV. 6**  
**The mean and standard deviation of pre test and post test of control group**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev</b>
<b>Pre-Test</b>	60.40	9.092
<b>Post-Test</b>	62.90	7.029

From the table above, the distance between Mean (Mx) and Standart Deviation ( $\sigma$ ) is too far. In other word, the scores obtain are normal.

### **3. The Students' Classifications Score of the Students Who are Taught By Using Think Pair Share Strategy and those who are taught by using Conventional Strategy.**

To know how the students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy and those who are taught by using Conventional strategy, the researcher only took the post-test score of each class, because the post-test was given after treatment.

**Table 1V. 7**

#### **Mean and Median of Post-Test in Experimental Class and Control Class**

	<b>Experiment Class</b>	<b>Control Class</b>
<b>Mean (Pre-Test)</b>	62.00	60.40
<b>Mean (Post-Test)</b>	73.53	62.90

From the table IV.7, the mean of pre-test of experiment class is 62.00 and the mean of post-test of Experiment Class is 73.53, meanwhile the mean pre-test of Experiment class is 60.40 and the mean post-test of Control Class is 62.90. To make

it clear the following table will describe the students' classification score whether taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy or those who are taught by using conventional strategy<sup>2</sup>:

**Table IV. 8**  
**The Classification of Students' Score**

THE SCORE LEVEL	CATEGORY
80-100	Very Good
66-79	Good
56-65	Enough
40-55	Less
30-30	Fail

Based on the table IV.8, the mean of pre-test of experiment class is 62.00, it is categories into enough level and the mean of post-test of Experiment Class is 73.53, it is categories into good level. Meanwhile the mean pre-test of control class is 60.40, it is categories into enough level and the mean post-test of control class is 62.90, it is categories into enough level. It can be stated that using Think Pair Share (TPS) could increase students' reading comprehension.

#### **4. The Data Presentation of the different between student's reading comprehension taught by using Think Pair Share and those who are not.**

The following table is the description of pre-test and post-test of experimental class and control class.

---

<sup>2</sup> Suharsimi Arikunto. *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. (Jakarta: Bumi Aksara, 2009), p. 245

**Table IV. 9**  
**Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test of Experimental and Control Class**

No	Student	Experiment Class			Control Class		
		Pre-Test	Post-Test	Gain	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Gain
1	Student 1	73	93	20	70	70	0
2	Student 2	57	66	9	53	63	10
3	Student 3	70	90	20	70	60	-9
4	Student 4	53	66	13	50	50	0
5	Student 5	43	57	-4	63	66	3
6	Student 6	57	70	-13	60	57	-3
7	Student 7	63	70	7	66	70	4
8	Student 8	70	87	17	63	66	3
9	Student 9	63	80	17	66	63	-3
10	Student 10	43	60	17	73	70	-3
11	Student 11	70	77	7	53	57	4
12	Student 12	57	70	13	43	57	14
13	Student 13	63	70	7	63	70	7
14	Student 14	53	60	7	63	73	10
15	Student 15	57	63	6	66	70	4
16	Student 16	66	77	11	50	60	10
17	Student 17	70	73	-3	50	57	7
18	Student 18	50	60	10	50	60	10
19	Student 19	57	77	20	53	60	7
20	Student 20	63	77	14	66	70	4
21	Student 21	80	90	10	70	50	-20
22	Student 22	53	63	10	53	50	-3
23	Student 23	60	73	13	77	80	3
24	Student 24	73	87	14	63	60	-3
25	Student 25	66	77	11	63	66	3
26	Student 26	73	77	4	50	63	13
27	Student 27	77	73	-4	66	63	-3
28	Student 28	53	70	17	66	66	0
29	Student 29	70	80	10	43	60	17
30	Student 30	57	73	16	70	60	-10

From the table above, it can be seen that there is actually significant different between pre-test and post-test in experiment class and pre-test and post-test in control class. It is also can be seen from the difference of the gain in the experimental class and control class. To make it clear, it will be analyze in the data analysis below.

### C. The Data Analysis

#### 1. Students' Reading Comprehension Taught by Using Think Pair Share Strategy.

The following table is the description of the data of students' pre-test and posttest scores of Experimental class. It was obtained from the result of their reading comprehension. The data can be described as follows:

**Table IV. 10**  
**Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores Of Experimental Class**

<b>Valid of Pre-Test</b>	<b>Frequency of Pre-Test</b>	<b>Standard Graduated</b>	<b>Valid of Post-Test</b>	<b>Frequency of Post-test</b>	<b>Standard Graduated</b>
43	2	No Pass	43	-	No Pass
50	1	No Pass	50	-	No Pass
53	4	No Pass	53	-	No Pass
57	6	No Pass	57	1	No Pass
60	1	Pass	60	3	Pass
63	4	Pass	63	2	Pass
66	2	Pass	66	2	Pass
70	5	Pass	70	5	Pass
73	3	Pass	73	4	Pass
77	1	Pass	77	6	Pass
80	1	Pass	80	2	Pass
87	-	Pass	87	2	Pass
90	-	Pass	90	2	Pass
93	-	Pass	93	1	Pass

<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>			<b>30</b>	
--------------	-----------	--	--	-----------	--

Based on the data obtained, in the pre-test of experimental class there were 13 students did not pass the graduated standard (SKL), or the score obtained  $< 60$  while there were 17 students passed the graduated standard (SKL), or the score obtained  $\geq 60$ . The percentage of students who do not pass the graduated standard as follows:

$$= \frac{13}{30} \times 100\%$$

$$= 43\%$$

The percentage of students who pass the graduated standard as follows:

$$= \frac{17}{30} \times 100\%$$

$$= 57\%$$

Besides, it can also be seen that the total frequency is 30 and the total pretest scores is 1860 so that Mean ( $M_x$ ) and Standard Deviation ( $\delta$ ) can be obtained by using SPSS as follows:

**Table IV. 11**  
**Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-Test Scores**

<b>Mean</b>	62.00
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	9.49

From the table above, the distance between Mean ( $M_x$ ) and Standard Deviation ( $\delta$ ) is too far. In other word, the scores obtained are normal.

In the post-test of experimental class there were 1 students did not pass the graduated standard (SKL), or the score obtained  $< 60$  while there were 29 students passed the graduated standard (SKL), or the score obtained  $\geq 60$ . The percentage of students who do not pass the graduated standard as follows:

$$= \frac{1}{30} \times 100\%$$

$$= 3.3333$$

The percentage of students who pass the graduated standard as follows:

$$= \frac{29}{30} \times 100\%$$

$$= 96.66\%$$

Besides, it can also be seen that the total frequency is 30 and the total scores is 2206 so that Mean ( $M_x$ ) and Standard Deviation ( $\delta$ ) can be obtained by using SPSS as follows.

**Table IV. 12**  
**Mean and Standard Deviation of Post-Test Scores**

<b>Mean</b>	73.53
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	9.58

From the table above, the distance between Mean ( $M_x$ ) and Standard Deviation ( $\delta$ ) is too far. In other word, the scores obtained are normal

## **2. Students' Reading Comprehension Taught by Using Conventional Strategy.**

The following table is the description of the data of students' pre-test and posttest scores of Control class. It was obtained from the result of their Reading comprehension. The data can be described as follows:

**Table IV. 13**  
**Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of Control Class**

<b>Valid of Pre-Test</b>	<b>Frequency of Pre-Test</b>	<b>Standard Graduated</b>	<b>Valid of Post-Test</b>	<b>Frequency of Post-test</b>	<b>Standard Graduated</b>
43	2	No Pass	43	-	No Pass
47	1	No Pass	47	-	No Pass
50	5	No Pass	50	3	No Pass
53	4	No Pass	53	-	No Pass
57	-	No Pass	57	4	No Pass
60	1	No Pass	60	7	Pass
63	6	No Pass	63	4	Pass
66	6	Pass	66	4	Pass
70	3	Pass	70	6	Pass
73	1	Pass	73	1	Pass
77	1	Pass	77	-	Pass
80	-	Pass	80	1	Pass
87	-	Pass			Pass
		Pass			Pass
		Pass			Pass
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>			<b>30</b>	

Based on the data obtained, in the pre-test of control class there were 16 students did not pass the graduated standard (SKL), or the score obtained < 60 while there were 14 students passed the graduated standard (SKL), or the score obtained ≥ 60. The percentage of students who do not pass the graduated standard as follows:

$$= \frac{16}{30} \times 100\%$$



$$= 53.33\%$$

The percentage of students who pass the graduated standard as follows:

$$= \frac{14}{30} \times 100\%$$

$$= 46.66\%$$

Besides, it can also be seen that the total frequency is 30 and the total scores is 1812 so that Mean ( $M_x$ ) and Standard Deviation ( $\delta$ ) can be obtained by using SPSS as follows.

**Table IV. 14**  
**Mean and Standard Deviation of Pre-Test Scores**

<b>Mean</b>	60.40
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	9.092

From the table above, the distance between Mean ( $M_x$ ) and Standard Deviation ( $\delta$ ) is too far. In other word, the scores obtained are normal

In the post-test of experimental class there were 7 students did not pass the graduated standard (SKL), or the score obtained  $< 60$  while there were 23 students passed the graduated standard (SKL), or the score obtained  $\geq 60$ . The percentage of students who do not pass the graduated standard as follows:

$$= \frac{7}{30} \times 100\%$$

$$= 23.33\%$$

The percentage of students who pass the graduated standard as follows:

$$= \frac{23}{30} \times 100 \%$$

$$= 76.66\%$$

Besides, it can also be seen that the total frequency is 30 and the total scores is 1448 so that Mean ( $M_x$ ) and Standard Deviation ( $\delta$ ) can be obtained by using SPSS as follows.

**Table IV. 15**  
**Mean and Standard Deviation of Post-Test Scores**

<b>Mean</b>	62.90
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	7.029

From the table above, the distance between Mean ( $M_x$ ) and Standard Deviation ( $\delta$ ) is too far. In other word, the scores obtained are normal.

### **3. Data Analysis of The Different between Students' Reading Comprehension taught by using Think Pair Share Strategy and those who are not.**

The following table is description of data of student's reading comprehension of experiment class and control class:

**Table IV.16**  
**Students' Reading Comprehension Score**

<b>No</b>	<b>Student</b>	<b>Experiment Class</b>			<b>Control Class</b>		
		<b>Pre-Test</b>	<b>Post-Test</b>	<b>Gain</b>	<b>Pre-Test</b>	<b>Post-Test</b>	<b>Gain</b>
1	Student 1	73	93	20	70	70	0
2	Student 2	57	66	9	53	63	10
3	Student 3	70	90	20	70	60	-9
4	Student 4	53	66	13	50	50	0

5	Student 5	43	57	-4	63	66	3
6	Student 6	57	70	-13	60	57	-3
7	Student 7	63	70	7	66	70	4
8	Student 8	70	87	17	63	66	3
9	Student 9	63	80	17	66	63	-3
10	Student 10	43	60	17	73	70	-3
11	Student 11	70	77	7	53	57	4
12	Student 12	57	70	13	43	57	14
13	Student 13	63	70	7	63	70	7
14	Student 14	53	60	7	63	73	10
15	Student 15	57	63	6	66	70	4
16	Student 16	66	77	11	50	60	10
17	Student 17	70	73	-3	50	57	7
18	Student 18	50	60	10	50	60	10
19	Student 19	57	77	20	53	60	7
20	Student 20	63	77	14	67	70	3
21	Student 21	80	90	10	70	50	-20
22	Student 22	53	63	10	53	50	-3
23	Student 23	60	73	13	77	80	3
24	Student24	73	87	14	63	60	-3
25	Student 25	66	77	11	63	66	3
26	Student 26	73	77	4	50	63	13
27	Student 27	77	73	-4	66	63	-3
28	Student 28	53	70	17	66	66	0
29	Student 29	70	80	10	43	60	17
30	Student 30	57	73	16	71	60	-9

The data were obtained through the gain of experimental group and control group. To analyze the data, the researcher used t-test formula by using software SPSS 16:

**Table IV.17**

Group Statistics				
Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score 1	30	9.8667	7.81569	1.42694

**Group Statistics**

Group		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Score	1	30	9.8667	7.81569	1.42694
	2	30	2.5333	7.69565	1.40503

**Table IV. 18**  
**Independent Samples Test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Score Equal variances assumed	.002	.965	3.662	58	.001	7.33333	2.00257	3.32476	11.31490
Equal variances not assumed			3.662	57.986	.001	7.33333	2.00257	3.32474	11.34192

From the table above, it can be seen that  $t_o$  is 3.662 and df is 58. The  $t_o$  obtained is compared to t table either at 5% or 1%. At level 5%, t table is 2,04 and at level 1%, t table is 2,76. Based on t table, it can be analyzed that  $t_o$  is higher than t table either at level 5 % or 1%. In other word, we can read  $2,04 < 3.662 > 2,76$ . So that the researcher can conclude that  $H_o$  is rejected and  $H_a$  is accepted. It means that there is significant different between students reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share strategy and those who are taught by using conventional strategy at the second year students of SMPN 1 Airtiris.

The experiment showed that the mean score of both group were different. The mean score of experiment class in pretest was 62.00 and post-test was 73.53, it rose

11,53. Besides, the mean score of result of control group in pretest was 60.40 and 62.90, it rose only 2.50. To make clear, it can be seen from the following table:

**Table IV. 19**

	<b>Experiment class</b>	<b>Control class</b>
Mean pretest	62.00	60.40
Mean posttest	73.53	62.90

From the table IV.19, it can be stated that using Think Pair Share strategy had effect positively to increase students' reading comprehension. It is proved by the different score in experimental group and control group that was 10.63, so using Think Pair Share strategy could increase students' reading comprehension.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

#### **A. Conclusion**

Based on data analysis and research finding in chapter IV, finally the research about the Effectiveness of Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy toward students' reading comprehension at the second year of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency comes to the conclusion as follows:

1. The mean pre-test of students' reading comprehension taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy is 62.00, it is categories into enough level and the mean of post-test of experiment class is 73.53, it is categories into good level.
2. The mean pre-test of students' reading comprehension taught by using conventional strategy is 60.40, it is categories into enough level and the mean post-test of control class is 62.90, it is categories into enough level.
3. Based on the data analysis, it can be seen that students reading comprehension who are taught by using Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy is better than students' reading comprehension who taught by using conventional strategy.

From the research the researcher can concludes that there is significant different between students' reading comprehension who are taught by using Think

Pair Share (TPS) strategy and those who are taught by using conventional strategy at the second year of SMPN 1 Airtiris of Kampar Regency.

## **B. Suggestion**

Considering the effectiveness of Think Pair Share strategy toward students' reading comprehension, the researcher would like to give some suggestions as follows:

- 1) Suggestions for the teacher:
  - a. It is recommended to teacher to use Think Pair Share strategy in teaching and learning process.
  - b. The teacher build a favorable atmosphere in teaching-learning process, because the conductive condition in teaching would become one asset to carry the success of material to be taught.
  - c. The teacher should be creative to select kinds o reading text in order to make students comprehend more the text and to diminish boredom in learning English especially in reading subject.
- 2) Suggestion for the students:
  - a. The students should try to understand to using Think Pair Share strategy in reading text and practice in the classroom.
  - b. The students pay more attention to the lesson that has been shared by students in front of the class.



- c. The students should avoid cheating in doing their exercises because in Think Pair Share strategy each student given time to think about his/her own answer. So students should independently do their exercise.

Finally, the researcher considers that this study still needs validation from the next researcher that has the same topic as this study.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anteng Ria A. 2007. *The Teaching of Reading Comprehension by Using Small Group Discussion at the First Year Students of SMP 1 Wanadadi In the Academic Year Of 2006/2007* (Semarang: Unpublished)
- Arends, Richard I. 2008. *Learning to Teach: Belajar untuk Mengajar*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1994. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc
- Cresswell. W. Jhon. 2008. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Pearson education.
- Delene Sholes. *Reading for Different Purposes: Strategies for Reading different kinds of Materials*. (Retrieved from <http://www.suite101.com/content/reading-for-different-purposes-a91899> on April 12, 2010)
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. 2006. *MODEL Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan dan Sillabus (KTSP) SMP dan MTs*. Solo: PT. Tiga Serangkai
- Ellen Douglas. *Reading Comprehension Strategies For English Language Learners*. (retrieved from <http://www.learnnc.org/lp/pages/724> on January 26, 2011)
- Gay, L.R and Peter Airasian. 2000. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Six Ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Grave, F m. 2001. *Teaching Reading in the 21st Century*. Botton: Allyn and Bacon Press
- Harmer, Jeremy. 2000. *How to Teach English*. Oxford: Longman University
- Hartono. 2008. *Statistik untuk Penelitian*. Jogjakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Haycraft, John. 1991. *An Introduction to English Language Teaching*. Singapore: Longman Singapore Publisher Pte Ltd.

- June Preszler. *On Target: Strategies that Differentiate Instruction Grades K-4*. (Dakota : Black Hills Special Services Cooperative)
- Isjoni, 2010. *Cooperative Learning Mengembangkan Kemampuan Belajar Kelompok*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Kalayo Hasibuan and Muhammad Fauzan A. 2007. *Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL)*. Pekanbaru: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press.
- Lyman. *Think Pairs Share Strategies for Reading Comprehension*. (retrieved from [http://www.teachervision.fen.com/group-work/cooperative-learning/48547.html?page=2&detoured=1&for\\_printing=1](http://www.teachervision.fen.com/group-work/cooperative-learning/48547.html?page=2&detoured=1&for_printing=1), 1981 on June 24, 2010).
- Mariane-Cerce, Murcia Lois. 1979. *Teaching English as a Second and Forign Language*. Newbury: Home Publisher, Inc.
- M. Syafii, S. 2007. *From Paragraph to a Research Report: A writing of English for Academic Purpose*. Pekanbaru: Lembaga Bimbingan Belajar Syaf Intensive.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *The Effective Paragraph Development: The Process of Writing For Classroom Settings*. Pekanbaru: LBSI.
- Nation, I. S. P. 2009. *Teaching ESL/ EFL Reading and Writing*. New York: Routledge.
- Nuttall, Christine. 1982. *9 Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. New York: Mc Grow Hill Book Company.
- Kathleen T. Mcwhorter. *Efficient and Flexible Reading*. (Harper Collin: Niagara country)
- Paulston, Cristina Bratt, and Mary Newton Bruder. 1976. *Teaching English as a Second Language Techniques and Procedures*. Massachusetts: Winthrop Publisher, Inc
- Schmidt, Richard, Jack C. Richards,. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Saskatoon Public Schools (retrieved from <http://olc.spsd.sk.ca/DE/PD/instr/strats/think/on> 24 June, 2010)
- Slavin, Robert E. 2010. *Cooperative Learning Teori, Riset, dan Praktik*, Bandung: Nusa Media.

- Sukardi. 2008. *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan: Kompetensi dan Praktik*  
 Jakarta: Bumi Aksara Richards, C. Jack and Richard Schmidt. 2<sup>o</sup>  
*Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*.  
 Third Edition . New York, Pearson Education.
- Trianto. *Mendesain Model Pembelajaran Inovatif-Progresif*. 2010. Jakarta:  
 Prenada Media Group
- Walter de gruyter. *Current Trends in the Development and Teaching of the Four  
 Language Skills*. (Berlin: Library Of Congress Cataloging)